UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/037,175	11/09/2001	James R. Doran	END920010073US1	6793

7590 08/20/2004	EXAMINER
John R. Pivnichny, Ph.D.	TRUONG, LECHI
IBM Corporation, N50/040-4	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2126	

John R. Pivnichny, Ph.D.
IBM Corporation, N50/040-4
1701 North Street
Endicott, NY 13760

DATE MAILED: 08/20/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

PTO-90C (Rev. 10/03)

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Office Action Summary	10/037,175	JAMES R. DORAN
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	LeChi Truong	2126	

-- *The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address* --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE _3_ MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on _09 November 2001_.

2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.

3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) ☒ Claim(s) _1-21_ is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) ☒ Claim(s) _1-21_ is/are rejected.

7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:

      1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

      2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

      3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application) since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78.

    a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.

14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121 since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____.

4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____.

5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

6) ☐ Other: .

DETAILED ACTION

1.   Claims 1-21 are presented for the examination.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in
> section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are
> such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person
> having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the
> manner in which the invention was made.

2.   Claims **1, 4, 5, 7, 9, 10, 13, 15, 16, 18, 20** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being

unpatentable over Li (US. Patent 6,748,386 B1) in view of Gupta et al (US. Patent 5,826,258).

3.   **As to claim 1**, Li teaches the application substantially as claimed including: a data store

having a plurality of directory entries (DBMSs 70/78, col 6, ln 47-50/ Fig. 2B), a server server

(the application server 52, col 6, ln 47-50), a API couple to said data stored (common database

connectivity API 76, Fig. 2 B/ col 6, ln 47-50), a receiving a directory entry (col 7, ln 50-53), a

wrapper (a wrapper servlet the name of the original server, col 6, ln 30-37/ wrapper JDBC 78,

col 6, ln 60-67/ fig. 2B) user application(a user application , col 3, ln 46-50), a wrapper coupled

to said API for accepting request from a user interface(col 3, ln 46-67/ col 6, ln 64-67/ col 3, ln

52-67).

4.   Li does not explicit teach request as a query which is sent to a wrapper . However, Gupta

teaches sending query to wrapper (query is sent through wrapper , col 9,l n 7-12).

5.   It would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention

was made to combine the teaching of Li and Gupta because Gupta's query would retrieves

information from the databases.

6.   **As to claim 4,** Li teaches a plurality of API coupled to said data store, each API adapted

to send said query to said data store and receive one of said plurality of directory entries (the API

of DBMS 70 and external information source 74, Fig. 3/ col 6, ln 55-67 col 6, ln 42-50).

7.   **As to claim 5,** Li teaches a plurality of wrapper each said wrapper coupled to one or

more of said API (a wrapper servlet the name of the original server, col 6, ln 30-37/ wrapper

JDBC 78, col 6, ln 60-67/ fig. 2B).

8.   **As to claim 7,** Li teaches API is adapted to receive one of said plurality of directory

entries from said data store and send said one of the directory entries to said user application (col

7, ln 17-24).

9.   **As to claim 9,** Li teaches API is adapted to received said one of said plurality of directory

entries in response to said query (col 7, ln 17-20).

10.   **As to claim 10,** it is an apparatus claim of claims 1 and 7; therefore, it is rejected for the

same reasons as claim 1 and 7 above.

11.   **As to claims 13, 15, 16,** they are apparatus claims of claims 4, 5,17; therefore, they are

rejected for the same reasons as claims 4, 5, 17 above.

12.   **As to claim 18,** it is an apparatus claim of claim 10; therefore, it is rejected for the same

reason as claim 10 above.

13. **As to claim 20**, it is rejected for the same reason as claim 10; therefore, it is rejected for the same reason as claim 10 above. In additional, Li teaches program instruction (programs, col 3, ln 52-54).

14. Claims **2, 3, 11, 12** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Li (US. Patent 6,748,386 B1) in view of Gupta et al (US. Patent 5,826,258) further in view of Kumar et al (US. Patent 6,343,287 B1).

15. **As to claim 2,3**, Li and Gupta do not teach a relational database, an LDAP data store. However, Kumar teaches a relational database, LDAP (relational database, LDAP, Fig. 3).

16. It would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teaching of Li, Gupta and Kumar because Kumar's relational database and LDAP would allow user to initiate a search for the requesting from the user.

17. **As to claims 11, 12**, they are apparatus claims of claims 2, 3; therefore, they are rejected for the same reasons as claims 2, 3 above.

18. Claims **6, 14, 19**, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Li (US. Patent 6,748,386 B1) in view of Gupta et al (US. Patent 5,826,258) and further in view of Coden et al (US. Patent 5,873,080).

19. **As to claim 6**, Li and Gupta do not teach an API locator on said web server for selecting one of said plurality of API in response to said query. However, Coden teaches an API locator on

said web server for selecting one of said plurality of API in response to said query (each query

object (112-117) contained in the combined query 110 is directed by the query interface 130 to

one ore more engineers by calls to that engine's application programming interface (API) (152,

154, 156) respectively, col 6, ln 46-51/ ln 60-66).

20.   It would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention

was made to combine the teaching of Li, Gupta and Coden because Coden's each query object

(112-117) contained in the combined query 110 is directed by the query interface 130 to one ore

more engineers by calls to that engine's application programming interface (API) (152, 154, 156)

respectively would find relevant documents need to be able to specify conditions on the content.

21.   As to claims 14, 19, they are apparatus claim of claim 6; therefore, they are rejected for

the same reason as claim 6 above.

22.   Claims **8, 17, 21** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Li (US.

Patent 6,748,386 B1) in view of Gupta et al (US. Patent 5,826,258) and further in view of

Madnick et al (US. 6,282,537 B1).

23.   As to claim 8, Li and Gupta do not teach send said one of said directory entries to said

user application through said wrapper. However, Madnick teaches send said one of said directory

entries to said user application through said wrapper (the results from the semi-structured data

sources distributed over the network are returned to the wrapper generator 614, col 15, ln 1-6).

24.   It would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention

was made to combine the teaching of Li , Gupta and Madnick because Madnick's the results

from the semi-structured data sources distributed over the network are returned to the wrapper

generator 614 would provide to the user with a complete response to the query.

25.   **As to claims 17, 21**, they are apparatus claim of claim 8; therefore, they are rejected for

the same reason as claim 8 above.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to LeChi Truong whose telephone number is (703) 305 5312. The

examiner can normally be reached on 8 - 5.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, Meng-Ai An can be reached on 703-305-9678. The fax phone number for the

organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent

Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications

may be obtained from either Private PAIR of Public PAIP. Status information for unpublished

applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR

system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIP

system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197(toll-free).

LeChi Truong

August 17, 2004

MENG-AI T. AN
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100